

BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2003-276-W/S – ORDER NO. 2004-99

MARCH 8, 2004

IN RE: Application of Sherwood Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Sherwood Utilities Company for Approval of an Increase in its Water and Sewer Rates and Charges	) ORDER RULING ON ) APPLICATION FOR ) INCREASE IN RATES ) AND REQUEST TO BE ) CLASSIFIED AS A ) SUBMETERER
--	---

✓ 2NG

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This matter is before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the “Commission”) on the Application of Sherwood Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Sherwood Utilities Company (“Sherwood” or the “Company”), filed on September 10, 2003, seeking approval of a new schedule of rates and charges for water and sewer service that Sherwood provides to its customers within its authorized service areas in South Carolina. The Application was filed pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-5-210 *et seq.* (1976), as amended, and 26 S.C. Regs. 103-821 (1976).

By letter dated October 13, 2003, the Commission’s Deputy Executive Director instructed Sherwood to publish a prepared Notice of Filing, one time, in newspapers of general circulation in the areas affected by Sherwood’s Application. The Notice of Filing indicated the nature of the Application and advised all interested persons desiring to participate in the scheduled proceedings of the manner and time in which to file

appropriate pleadings for inclusion in the proceedings. In the letter of October 13, 2003, the Deputy Executive Director also instructed Sherwood to notify directly, by U.S. Mail, each customer affected by the Application by mailing each customer a copy of the Notice of Filing. Sherwood furnished the Commission with an Affidavit of Publication and a Certificate of Mailing demonstrating that the Notice of Filing had been duly published and mailed to all customers affected by the Application in accordance with the instructions of the Deputy Executive Director. In response to the Notice of Filing, a Petition to Intervene was filed on behalf of Elliott Elam, Jr., Acting Consumer Advocate for the State of South Carolina (the “Consumer Advocate”).

On January 6, 2004, the Commission received a letter from the President of Sherwood, Mr. Robert W. Ashby, stating that the Company would also be requesting of the Commission at the hearing on this matter that Sherwood be released from the classification of a utility company and reclassified as a submeterer.

S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-3-95 (Supp.2003) provides in relevant part that “[w]henever a corporation or person furnishing ... water, sewerage collection, sewerage disposal, ... files a schedule setting forth proposed changes with the Commission pursuant to the procedures prescribed in this title, a panel of three members of the Commission shall hear and rule on the proposed changes.” Pursuant to S.C. Code Ann §58-3-95 (Supp.2003), the Chairman of the Commission appointed the panel to hear and rule on Sherwood’s Application. The panel consisted of Commissioner Saunders, presiding, Commissioner Carruth, and Commissioner Atkins.

During the proceedings, Sherwood was represented by its President, Mr. Robert W. Ashby. The Office of the Consumer Advocate was represented by Elliott F. Elam, Jr., Esquire. The Commission Staff (“Staff”) was represented by F. David Butler, General Counsel.

At the public hearing on February 12, 2004, no customers of Sherwood appeared to intervene in this matter or to in any other way object to the Application of the Company. The Consumer Advocate participated in the proceedings but presented no witnesses. The Commission Staff presented the testimony of Barbara J. Crawford, an Auditor for the Public Service Commission of South Carolina, and William O. Richardson, Chief of Water and Wastewater with the Public Service Commission of South Carolina.

In considering the Application of Sherwood, the Commission must consider competing interests. The interests of the consumers to receive quality service and a quality product at a reasonable rate compete with the interests of the provider to have the opportunity to earn a fair rate of return. Regulation, as it has developed in the United States, is concerned with rates, service, [and] safety .... Charles F. Phillips, Jr., *The Regulation of Public Utilities*, (1993) at 171. Rate regulation has two aspects: control of the rate level (earnings) and control of the rate structure (prices). *Id.* As to the rate level, public utilities are entitled to cover all allowable operating costs and to have the opportunity to earn a “fair” rate of return. *Id.* Collectively, these items comprise a company’s total revenue requirements. *Id.* As to the rate structure, public utilities are permitted to establish rates that, at a minimum, will cover their revenue requirements. *Id.*

at 171-72. Such rates must be “just and reasonable,” with no “undue” discrimination. *Id.* at 172.

Thus, in considering the Application of Sherwood, the Commission must give due consideration to the Company’s total revenue requirements, comprised of allowable operating costs and the opportunity to earn a fair rate of return. To this end, the Commission will review the operating revenues and operating expenses of Sherwood and will endeavor to establish adequate and reasonable levels of revenues and expenses. Further, the Commission will consider a fair return for Sherwood based upon the record before it. Should the Commission’s determination show that rates should be increased, the Commission will then design rates that will meet the revenue requirements of Sherwood but that are also just and reasonable and free of undue discrimination.

## **II. FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. We find that Sherwood is a water and sewer utility providing water and sewer service in its assigned service areas within South Carolina, and its operations in South Carolina are subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 58-5-10, *et seq.* (1976), as amended.

2. We find that Sherwood is supplied water by the City of Charleston Department of Public Works and sewer service by the North Charleston Sewer District. Sherwood owns no facilities to treat either water or sewage. Sherwood meters the water entering its service area which consists of two mobile home parks and one apartment complex in Charleston County, South Carolina. Sherwood owns the water and sewage pipes in its service area and the individual meters for measuring water service to its

customers. The water usage determines combined usage of water and sewer services. Sherwood purchases water from the City of Charleston Department of Public Works and sewer treatment services from the North Charleston Sewer District. Sherwood does not treat the water or sewage sold to its customers. Sherwood currently pays a combined rate for water and sewage of \$6.58 per thousand gallons; yet Sherwood charges its customers a rate of \$4.96 per thousand with the initial 1,000 gallons being included in its base rate of \$5.00 per month.

3. We find that the Company has not asked for a specific rate-setting methodology in this case. Because the only information as to rate base provided in the course of this proceeding reveals a net book value of \$4,852.53 for the Company's meters, we find that the proper rate-setting methodology to use in this case is the operating margin. We find the operating margin the proper rate-setting methodology as Sherwood has an insufficient rate base upon which to set rates.

4. We find that the appropriate test year period for the purposes of this proceeding is the twelve-month period ending December 31, 2002.

5. We find that the test year per book operating experience is a loss of \$(28,373.00) and after Staff's accounting and pro forma adjustments, that Sherwood operated at a negative margin of (75.99)% for the test year. Hearing No. 2 at Audit Exhibit A-5.

6. We find that through its Application, Sherwood is seeking an increase in its rates and charges for water and sewer service which results in additional annual revenues, as calculated by Staff, of \$49,621.00.

---

7. We find that operating revenues for Sherwood for the test year under present rates, and after accounting and pro forma adjustments, is \$38,515.00.

8. We find that the appropriate operating expenses for Sherwood for the test year under present rates and after accounting and pro forma adjustments are \$67,781.00.

9. We find that the rates requested by Sherwood produce an operating margin of 18.28% and total operating revenues of \$88,136.00. We further find a 10% operating margin reasonable and find that a 10% operating margin will require an increase in revenues of \$39,300.00 and a total revenue requirement \$77,815.00.

10. We find that in designing rates for Sherwood, a uniform rate schedule containing both a moderate combined base facility charge of \$8.00 per month and a combined commodity charge for water and sewer is appropriate.

11. We find that the appropriate operating margin for Sherwood based upon the approved adjustments and rates is 10%. In order to have the opportunity to obtain a 10% operating margin, Sherwood will have a revenue requirement of \$77,815.00. To obtain this revenue requirement, we find that Sherwood is authorized to adjust its rates and fees in the following particulars: 1) to charge a combined monthly base charge of \$8.00, 2) to charge a combined commodity charge of \$8.11 per thousand gallons, and 3) to charge its customers non-recurring fees of \$25.00 for reconnections and \$35.00 for new customer deposits.

12. We find that Sherwood is not entitled to be classified as a submeterer, and therefore, the Commission retains jurisdiction over the rates and operations of the Company.

### III. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS

In this section, the Commission sets forth the evidence relied upon in making its Findings of Fact as set forth in Section II of this Order.

#### 1. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FINDINGS OF FACT NO. 1 and 2

The evidence supporting this finding concerning the Company's business and legal status is contained in the Application filed by Sherwood and in prior Commission Orders in the docket files of the Commission, of which the Commission takes judicial notice. This finding of fact is essentially informational, procedural, and jurisdictional in nature, and the matters which it involves are not contested by any party.

#### 2. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FINDING OF FACT NO. 3

According to Sherwood, due to the substantial increase in the rates which it is paying for the commodities which it resells to its customers (water and sewer services), the Company is entitled to a rate increase but recommended no methodology to the Commission by which this determination should be made. Application of Sherwood. "The Public Service Commission has wide latitude to determine an appropriate rate-setting methodology." *Heater of Seabrook v. Public Serv. Comm'n of South Carolina*, 324 S.C. 56, 64, 478 S.E. 2d 826, 830 (1996). S. C. Code Ann. Section 58-5-240 (H) (Supp. 2003) directs the Commission to specify an allowable operating margin in all water and wastewater orders. In its Application, Sherwood did not provide any information regarding rate base. Sherwood's Application showed only a schedule of equipment for meters with a net book value, after depreciation, of \$4,852.53. As Sherwood did not provide any specific rate base information, Staff could not, and did not,

provide any information on rate base. Because the only information as to rate base provided in the course of this proceeding is the value of the meters, the Commission finds that the proper rate-setting method in this case is the operating margin methodology.

### 3. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FINDING OF FACT NO. 4

The evidence supporting this finding, that the appropriate test year period for the purposes of this proceeding is the twelve-month period ending December 31, 2002, is contained in the Application filed by Sherwood and in the testimony and exhibits of the parties' witnesses.

On September 10, 2003, Sherwood filed its Application requesting approval of the rate schedules designed to produce an increase in gross revenues of \$50,009.00. Sherwood's Application was based on a test period consisting of the twelve-months ending December 31, 2002. The Staff likewise offered their evidence generally within the context of the same test period. The Consumer Advocate offered no evidence.

A fundamental principle of the ratemaking process is the establishment of a test year period. In *Heater of Seabrook v. Public Service Commission of South Carolina*, 324 S.C. 56, 478 S.E.2d 826 (1996), the Supreme Court of South Carolina noted that "[t]he 'test year' concept is very important in the rate-setting process. In order to determine what a utility's expenses and revenues are for purposes of determining the reasonableness of a rate, one must select a 'test year' for the measurement of the expenses and revenues." 478 S.E.2d 828 n.1 (1996). The test year is established to provide a basis for making the most accurate forecast of the utility's rate base, reserves, and expenses in the near future when the prescribed rates are in effect. *Porter v. South Carolina Public Service*



*Commission*, 328 S.C. 222, 493 S.E.2d 92 (1997), citing *Hamm v. S.C. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 309 S.C. 282, 422 S.E.2d 110 (1992). The test year provides a basis upon which a commission staff will conduct its audit of a company's books. Phillips, *The Regulation of Public Utilities* at 196. For rate-making purposes, only just and reasonable expenses are allowed; only used and useful property (with certain exceptions) is permitted in the rate base. *Id.* The commission must have a basis for estimating future revenue requirements. *Id.*

The Commission concludes that the appropriate test year to use in the instant proceeding is the twelve-month period ending December 31, 2002. No party contested the use of that test year as proposed by Sherwood in its Application. To the contrary, all parties relied upon that test year period in presenting their evidence.

#### 4. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FINDING OF FACT NO. 5

The Staff reviewed the books of Sherwood and verified a per book loss for the test year for the Company of \$(28,373.00) and an operating margin of (74.42)%. Testimony of Crawford; Hearing Exhibit No. 2, Audit Exhibit A. The Staff calculations were not disputed by the Company, and no additional evidence regarding these calculations were submitted by the Company or the Consumer Advocate.

#### 5. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FINDING OF FACT NO. 6

##### (1) Position of Sherwood:

Sherwood presented its President, Robert W. Ashby, to testify. Mr. Ashby presented the Company's Application, which he had prepared and which was marked as Exhibit 1 in this case, in support of his testimony. Mr. Ashby testified that the Company

was requesting an increase in rates of \$50,009.00. (See Application of Sherwood and Hearing Exhibit No. 1). The request included increasing the monthly base charge from \$5.00 (which had included the first 1,000 gallons) to \$8.00 per month (without the first 1,000 gallons), increasing the combined cost of water and sewer from \$4.96 to \$9.44 per 1,000 gallons, increasing reconnect fees from \$10.00 to \$25.00, and establishing a deposit fee of \$35.00. Id.

(2) Position of Staff:

William O. Richardson, Chief of Water and Wastewater in the Commission Utilities Department, testified on behalf of the Staff concerning the proposed increase in rates. Mr. Richardson testified that he had calculated the proposed increase in rates to yield increased revenues to the Company of \$49,621.00. Hearing Exhibit No. 3, Utilities Department Exhibit No. 2. The \$388 difference between the Staff and the Company in the effect of the Company's proposed increase was due to an adjustment of \$388 proposed by the Staff to annualize test year revenues using actual test year billing units and consumption. Id.

(3) Position of the Consumer Advocate:

The Consumer Advocate offered no evidence or testimony regarding the current or proposed charges .

(4) Decision of the Commission: We find that the Staff's calculation of additional revenues requested by the Application to be the appropriate level of revenues sought. Staff's calculation based on test year billing units and consumption records provides an accurate level of the requested rates.

6. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FINDING OF FACT NO. 7

The operating revenues for Sherwood for the test year were reported by the Company as \$38,127.49. The Staff made certain minor accounting and pro forma adjustments to the Company's figures and computed the operating revenues to be \$38,515.00. The \$388.00 difference is caused by the Staff's adjustment to per book revenues to annualize test year revenues using actual billing units and consumption data in arriving at total as adjusted revenues. Neither the Company nor the Consumer Advocate challenged or objected to the operating revenues as computed by the Staff.

7. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FINDING OF FACT NO. 8

Per the Company books, operating expenses for Sherwood in the test year were \$66,500.00. Ms. Crawford testified on behalf of the Staff that while the owner did not maintain a separate set of books and records for the utility, that the costs were segregated and therefore easily broken out for audit and review by the Commission Staff. The Staff reviewed the books and made adjustments totaling \$1,281.00, as shown in Audit Exhibit A to the Report of the Audit Department, Hearing Exhibit No. 2. The adjustments were for (1) annualized wages for meter reading and repair expense in the amount of \$500.00, of which \$200.00 is attributable to water and \$300.00 attributable to sewer, (2) annualized wages for billing and collection expense in the amount of \$667.00, of which \$267.00 is attributable to water and \$400.00 is attributable to sewer, and (3) payroll taxes associated with the annualized wages for the two wage adjustments in the amount of \$114.00, of which \$46.00 is attributable to water operations and \$68.00 is attributable to sewer operations. After the adjustments, the Staff calculated total Operating Expenses

for the Company to be \$67,781.00. Neither the Company nor the Consumer Advocate challenged the Staff's calculations.

8. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FINDING OF FACT NO. 9

As previously stated herein, the Company has requested a rate increase of \$49,621.00. Of the requested increase, \$19,879.00 is attributable to water operations and \$29,742.00 is attributable to sewer operations. See Hearing Exhibit No. 2, Audit Exhibit A-1, p. 2 of 3. The requested increase of \$49,621.00 with the as adjusted test year operating revenues of \$38,515.00 produce Total Operating Revenues after the Proposed Increase of \$88,136.00. Total Operating Revenues after the Proposed Increase of \$88,136.00 and the herein approved Total Operating Expenses of \$72,024.00 result in Net Income for Return of \$16,112.00 and produce an operating margin after the proposed increase of 18.28%.

It appears that Sherwood developed its rates not by relying on any particular return but by trying to reach a desired yearly revenue. Mr. Ashby testified that his utility was losing money, that he had lost over \$170,000.00 over the past ten years, and that he needed the increase in rates. However, no specific methodology was offered by Sherwood in reaching the proposed rates. It appears from the record that the requested rates which yield the operating margin of 18.28 % were at least in part requested in order to compensate the Company for past losses. As allowing Sherwood to recover past losses in future rates would constitute retroactive ratemaking, the Commission declines to give the Company the full requested rates.

The Consumer Advocate requested a base rate of \$6.00 and a combined commodity rate of \$6.58 but introduced no evidence to support this recommendation or the revenues or operating margin these rates would yield. However, we recognize that the rates of a \$6.00 base charge and \$6.58 combined commodity rate as proposed by the Consumer Advocate would continue to provide the Company with a negative operating margin. We can determine that the proposed rates of the Consumer Advocate would result in a negative operating margin because as shown in Hearing Exhibit No. 3, Utilities Department Exhibit No. 6, a base rate of \$8.00 and a combined commodity charge of \$6.87 would be required to obtain a zero percent operating margin.

We therefore reject both the Company's requested rates and the Consumer Advocate's recommendation in favor of a reasonable operating margin in the best interests of both the Company and its customers. Staff provided proposed revenue requirements for alternate operating margins of 0%, 5%, 10%, and 15%. See Hearing Exhibit No. 3, Utilities Department Exhibit No. 6. Under an operating margin of 10%, it is anticipated that the Company would garner an increase in revenues of \$39,300.00. The required revenue requirement to produce a 10% operating margin after increase is calculated by Staff to be \$77,815.00.

Reviewing the alternate operating margins in the Staff's exhibit, we find an operating margin of 10% after the rate increase to be a reasonable return for the utility. A 10% operating margin will produce a Net Income for Return of \$7,778.00<sup>1</sup>. Mr. Ashby receives no salary for his services to the utility. In light of this fact, we find the Net

---

<sup>1</sup> Operating revenue of \$77,815.00 minus operating expenses of \$70,037 equals net income of \$7,778.00. Dividing the net income of \$7,778.00 by the operating revenue of \$77,815.00 produces an operating margin of 10%.

Income for Return of \$7,778 produced by a 10% operating margin to be a reasonable return for the utility.

9. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FINDING OF FACT NO. 10

Upon determination of the revenue requirements for a utility in a ratemaking proceeding, the next step is the determination of the specific rates or rate structure that will yield the required revenues. A generally accepted principle is that proper utility regulation requires the exercise of control over a utility's rate structure.

In designing rates for the Company, the Commission strives to set rates that are "just and reasonable" and without undue discrimination. In the case before the Commission, Sherwood has requested rates which contain both a moderate base facility charge for water and sewer service and a combined commodity charge. Because Sherwood has limited facilities (primarily lines and meters) and incurs the majority of its costs in the purchase of water and sewer services, the Commission finds that such a combined rate schedule is fair and reasonable and is in the best interests of the customers and Sherwood.

10. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FINDING OF FACT NO. 11

S.C. Code Ann. Section 5-240(H) (Supp. 2003) provides, in part, that "[t]he [C]ommission shall specify an allowable operating margin in all water and wastewater orders." We find that the appropriate operating margin in this matter is calculated to be 10%. We find that the following rates provide an income requirement that will permit the Company to cover operating costs and provide it with an opportunity to earn the

approved operating margin. The following table illustrates the calculations of the Proposed Increase in rates required to achieve a 10% operating margin for Sherwood:

TABLE

Current Revenue	\$38,515.00
Proposed Increase Required	<u>39,300.00</u>
Revenue Required After Increase (\$8.00 base fee + \$8.11 combined commodity charge)	77,815.00
Operating Expenses	<u>(\$70,037.00)</u>
Net Income from Return	<u>\$7,778.00</u>
Operating Margin	<u>10%</u>

As demonstrated in the Table, a 10% operating margin for Sherwood requires an increase in revenues of \$39,300.00. To obtain an increase in revenues of \$39,300.00, the Commission Staff calculated that the base fee for customers would need to be increased to \$8.00 per month and the combined commodity charge increased to \$8.11 per thousand gallons. These figures were provided to the Commission and made a part of the record in this matter as Utilities Department Exhibit No. 6 to Hearing Exhibit No. 2.

#### 11. EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FOR FINDING OF FACT NO. 12

Finally, we reject the Company's request to be classified as a submeterer. First, the Company's request to be classified as a submeterer was not provided in the Application that was filed on September 10, 2003, but was provided by letter to the Commission dated January 6, 2004, almost four months after the Application was filed. No information or evidence was offered to the Commission either prior to or at the hearing in this matter to support the Company's request with the exception of a letter filed on January 15, 2004. The only information offered at the hearing in regards to the request to be classified a submeterer was elicited on cross examination of the Company's

witness and that information failed to establish any cause for the Commission to grant the request. Further, in the aforementioned letter received January 15, 2004, Mr. Ashby specifically stated that the rates the Company would charge if permitted to operate as a submeterer would in part be used to “apply against previous losses from 1993 to date in the amount of \$170,540.39.” In effect, Mr. Ashby notified the Commission that the rates he would impose if released from the jurisdiction of this Commission would be retroactive in nature. Although it does not process water or sewage, by proposing to charge commodity rates to its customers which are in excess of those paid by Sherwood to the North Charleston Sewer District and Charleston Public Works, the Company is not a submeterer making a straight pass through of rates. As the Commission cannot approve of retroactive ratemaking and because Sherwood is acting as a public utility by not making a straight pass through of water and sewer rates, we find that Sherwood is not a submeterer, we find that it is in the best interests of the public to maintain jurisdiction over Sherwood.

Based on the lack of any evidence to support its request and the other reasons stated herein, we decline to reclassify Sherwood as a submeterer at this time.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Based upon the Findings of Fact as contained herein and the record of the instant proceeding, the Commission makes the following Conclusions of Law:<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The Commission’s analyses which give rise to the Conclusions of Law are contained in the discussions of Section III of this Order.



1. The operating margin is the appropriate guide for the Commission to use in determining the lawfulness of the rates of Sherwood and in fixing of just and reasonable rates for Sherwood to charge its customers in South Carolina.

2. A fair operating margin for the operations of Sherwood in South Carolina is 10%, which we conclude will provide a fair return to the Company and provide fair and reasonable rates to the Company's customers.

3. For the test year of December 31, 2002, the appropriate operating revenues, under present rates and as adjusted in this Order, are \$38,515.00, and the appropriate operating expenses, under present rates and as adjusted in this Order, are \$67,781.00.

4. Using the operating margin of 10% found to be fair and reasonable in this Order, the required revenue for Sherwood is \$77,815.00.

5. In order for Sherwood to have an opportunity to earn the operating margin found reasonable and approved in this Order and to meet the income requirement, Sherwood must be allowed additional revenues of \$39,300.00.

6. The rates approved in this Order are designed to be just and reasonable without undue discrimination and are also designed to meet the revenue requirements of the Company.

7. Based on the adjustments and the increase in rates approved herein, the appropriate rates for Sherwood to charge its customers are a monthly base charge of \$8.00 along with a combined commodity charge of \$8.11 per thousand gallons of water

and sewage. We also approve non-recurring fees of \$25.00 for reconnections and \$35.00 deposits for new customers.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

1. Sherwood is granted an operating margin for its water and sewer operations in South Carolina of 10%.

2. The schedule of rates and charges attached hereto as Appendix A are hereby approved for service rendered on or after the date of this Order. Further, the schedules are deemed to be filed with the Commission pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-5-240 (Supp. 2003).

3. Should the schedules approved herein and attached hereto as Appendix A not be placed in effect until three (3) months from the effective date of this Order, the schedules shall not be charged without written permission from the Commission.

4. Sherwood shall maintain its books and records for water and sewer operations in accordance with the NARUC Uniform System of Accounts for Class C Water and Sewer Utilities, as adopted by this Commission

5. This Order shall remain in full force and effect until further Order of the Commission.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:



Mignon Clyburn, Chairman

ATTEST:



Bruce F. Duke, Executive Director

(SEAL)

**APPENDIX A**

Sherwood Enterprises, Inc. DBA Sherwood Utilities  
2215 Hayne Street  
Charleston, SC 29418  
843-553-1900

FILED PURSUANT TO DOCKET NO. 2003-276-W/S – ORDER NO. 2004-99

EFFECTIVE DATE: MARCH 8, 2004

MINIMUM MONTHLY BASE CHARGE FOR WATER & SEWER SERVICE	\$8.00
---	--------

COMBINED COMMODITY CHARGE PER 1000 GALLONS OF WATER AND SEWER	\$8.11
--	--------

NON-RECURRING FEES:

RECONNECT FEE	\$25.00
---------------	---------

DEPOSIT FOR NEW CUSTOMER	\$35.00
--------------------------	---------